

Material for harassment and bullying complaint interview August 12, 2020* **

(b) (6) investigator
(b) (6)

***This material is illustrative rather than exhausted. I have not attempted to identify every single incidence of bullying or harassment I have experienced over the past seven years in my department at the Naval War College. I pulled this material together quickly to meet the investigator's timeline with the intention of laying out the patterns of gender-based bullying and harassment I have experienced in the Strategy and Policy Department.**

****I make two big assumptions in relaying information conveyed to me by others. First, I assume that what my interlocutors told me is accurate to the best of their knowledge. Second, I assume that they will tell the investigator what they told me because it is accurate.**

Background

(b) (6)

Worked in highly sexist food industry

Worked in heavily male dominated journalism

Work in heavily male dominated part of academia, bombs and bullets

Because of the subject of my research I interact with many mil members, nearly all male

Never seen gender attitudes like those in S&P. Couldn't believe it at first. Totally bought the story that everything was my fault.

Gender discrimination context in the department: patterns of gender exclusion based on gender assumptions circa 1961 or so among some of the most powerful civilian members:

How women talk in meetings to fend off possible criticism and anger by male colleagues (b) (6)

(b) (6) on why he assigned (b) (6) to me and (b) (6) to (b) (6) Gender-based assumption about what women are like.

(b) (6) on who counts as "we" in the department: the men only. "We only wear suits on stage." All the women in the department at that time wore suits all the time.

Language: manning, coat and tie.

Woman officer wrote a long comment in her SLC student evaluation a few years ago pointing out that she was routinely shouted down, interrupted, and ignored in seminar by the men present, including moderators, and that other women and POC had same experiences in S&P and other departments.

Several teaching partners told me that women and POC who get shouted down etc. need to deal with it themselves because that's real life. Pedagogically problematic as well as discriminatory.

Commentary: It is evident that a number of my colleagues mil and civ have simply not met or interacted before with someone like me: a woman who is a scholar who works on hard-core

security issues who is single and who is competent and confident. Their discomfort and behaviors based on it create and reinforce a hostile work environment in which I am afraid of my colleagues and fear for my job despite good performance.

Departmental sexism and the origin of (b) (6) decision to target me over the past six years for allegedly having a problem with mil officers and men:

Commentary: Patterns over time of humiliation, intimidation, bullying, criticisms that would not be directed at men.

(b) (6) was on leave the first year I was here so nothing from 2013-2014 AY on her behavior.

11/5/14 I sought (b) (6) out to ask her advice about team teaching. She questioned my abilities and professionalism, dismissed my experience as a teacher, dismissed as absurd the possibility that the problem might be on both sides, contradicted everything I said and when I agreed with things she said she also contradicted me. Evidently considered me someone who thinks military officers are stupid oafs. Didn't ask questions about how I work with partner, pointed out that I know nothing about what we teach [au contraire] since i've never been in the military or in combat [she has not either]. She also focused on the importance of pleasing students rather than helping them learn, whereas their learning is my goal. Said to let sexism roll off my back. Her teaching partner entered the room and she continued discussing me and my teaching partner in personal terms. Unprofessional, poisons atmosphere of department, and poisons the well for me with mil faculty. Demeaning. Humiliating. Intimidating.

2/3/15 (b) (6) talked to me about my lecturing, saying that I cock my head and shouldn't, and that I shouldn't pause when lecturing. Said she was sent by male faculty. She said she was delivering their message. "It's because of sexual harassment, of course." None of this would be said to a male lecturer. Demeaning. Humiliating. Intimidating.

3/12/15 (b) (6) complained again that I cock my head when I lecture, like a border collie, and said it was because I'm insecure. Perfect example of transference. Also it's my confidence and competence that grate on some of my colleagues, including her. Say to a man? Nope. Demeaning. Offensive. Intimidating. Also said that I'm original so people don't know what to make of me. Say this to male faculty? Unlikely. Demeaning. Humiliating.

3/24/15 (b) (6) claimed I dissed my teaching partner. [I have no idea what she's talking about.] Intimidating, humiliating.

5/2/15 (b) (6) again claimed I dissed my teaching partner. Builds sense that everything is my fault. Intimidating, humiliating.

5/17/15 (b) (6) told me, regarding complaints that I don't like men [none of which I have heard], that it's a predominantly male place and she handles it well because she has brothers. No mention of need for attitude adjustment on part of men. Clear implication that I'm not handling it well but all this is still from (b) (6) not any teaching partners. Places all blame on me for problem no one but she is bringing up. Also demeaning. Intimidating: change how you act or else, but it's not actually evident that I'm doing anything wrong.

7/21/15 I met with chair (b) (6) and XO (b) (6) for PARS. XO yelled at me, disparaged all things "academic." Said I'm too "authoritarian." Both said I'm "too intense." XO outraged at thought that gender might be playing a role in the teaching partner discomfort he was

telling me about [nothing from teaching partners to me]. Despite all this criticism, chair noted nonetheless that my Fall ILC evaluation scores were above average and that my scores rose with the notoriously difficult seniors this term. Demeaning and inappropriate and unprofessional to shout at me. Both interlocutors seemed to be reaching for criticisms. Humiliating and very intimidating. Threatened my MOU. Say these things to a man? Nope.

I sent emails asking the chair for benchmarks to meet so I'd know what I should be aiming for, given his criticisms. Never got any, heightening likelihood that criticisms are not serious but meant to intimidate.

I have more similar accounts of PARS meetings with (b) (6) so consider this representative. During his five years as chair (b) (6) threatened my job at every PARS meeting, heightening sense of intimidation, threat, hostility, reinforcing his position that I was doing everything wrong and was the only one at fault

10/30/15 Colleague (b) (6) told me that I freak out the military faculty and I should try to scare them less. He said we shouldn't have to hide our light under a basket but I might try dimming mine a little. Clearly providing a perspective gained from someone or multiple someones. Don't know who. Again emphasis is that this is my fault and in my power to correct. No discussion of mil mods' responsibility to behave professionally. I think this was a sympathetic attempt to help me. It's nonetheless offensive in its view of gender roles and reflects the larger discriminatory problem in the department.

3/6/16 I learned some specifics about teaching partner and XO complaints to (b) (6) and other senior faculty. (b) (6) the XO reportedly complained every time I sent in a note saying I'm working at home, which the chair had told us all to do. (b) (6) also complained that I know nothing about leadership, don't like men, and don't respect rank. No counseling from chair for complainers to behave professionally. Nothing on paper because they're afraid of retaliation. Nothing said to me. Intimidating, humiliating. Not likely to say to a man.

3/16/16 More problems complainers see as relayed to me, not by complainers themselves: I have a problem with male officers. I'm probably a feminist. I'm rigid and aloof. Teaching partner (b) (6) was offended that I asked him to help me clean the whiteboards after class once. He also complained that I try to make students into political scientists, but no one says this about my colleague political scientist (b) (6), who according to at least one of his teaching partners says little that makes sense to his students (his teaching partners have included (b) (6) (b) (6) (very political sciencey himself), (b) (6)). [I disagree with (b) (6) characterization of my teaching. Several senior faculty members have sat in on my seminars and none noted this. See (b) (6) and (b) (6), who is now at a (b) (6) think-tank. (b) (6) labeled me a problem because several of my students appealed their grades but (b) (6) said in a retreat later that she gets grade appeals all the time so this seems like a manufactured problem. Complaints that I'm a vegan. (b) (6) complained that I locked our office door when I left, locking him out, but he never told me I was doing this to him. No direct complaints to me from any teaching partners. Unlikely to hear these petty complaints about a man. No mention of counseling to tell these people to act like professionals and talk to me if they have a problem with anything I do or say.

5/4/16 (b) (6) mocked me as a vegan [which I am not]. More manufactured outrage. Humiliating, not to mention bizarre because he didn't seem to understand what the word means.

6/30/16 Reportedly chair (b) (6) complained that I wasn't at every one of the job talks for post-docs. He didn't look to see that I was on record as being out of town and at the doctor for the

talks I missed. Also reportedly there were complaints that I wasn't at the CIWAG conference when I should have been because I'm the irregular warfare person. Was (b) (6) mentioned as well as the senior IW person in the department? Was he available? Did he attend? I had not been told that I should attend. Seems like seizing the opportunity to criticize me and potentially not a man in the same situation of non-attendance. Intimidation. But I hadn't done anything wrong.

4/9/18 (b) (6) told me that requiring everyone to attend lectures would make the department more harmonious: We all used to go and things were better then. I disagreed and explained that I thought the problems and disagreements were more fundamental. She seemed angry and hostile, scaring me. She seemed to want to trap me into saying something she could use against me or goad me into some misbehavior. She kept misquoting me when I said things. E.g., when I said the department agrees on little, even definitions such as for grand strategy, at the core of what we teach in the SLC, her response was, "Oh, so only political scientists can understand the concept of grand strategy."

5/22/18 (b) (6) told me I have problems with teaching partners [which I'm unaware of] because I'm smart and that intimidates them. Be a den mother and be careful to not hurt their feelings, she said. No mention of need for professionalism on their part. Unlikely to be said to a man, demeaning, humiliating, intimidating (e.g., here's what you have to do to keep your job).

Commentary: Note that (b) (6) may have been soliciting negative responses from teaching partners rather than responding to their independent expressions of dissatisfaction or frustration.

6/7/18 At faculty retreat (b) (6) told me she wouldn't call on me because I'd already talked enough. Say to a man? Nope. Not something others in this department would notice or remember though most were there. Demeaning, humiliating, intimidating (clear order to keep my mouth shut).

2/13/19 (b) (6) told me my job is to be a den mother, to be in the office all the time to listen to whoever pops in. Not said to men, humiliating, denigrates my abilities and professionalism, intimidating. Also incorrect. "Den mother" is not in my MOU.

9/27/19 (b) (6) attacked my scholarship over my El Salvador monograph. "How can you say it was a success ...?" She's socially awkward at the best of times but this was clearly a studied attack and very odd. It also appears that she didn't understand or didn't remember what my argument was about the ES counterinsurgency case. I was afraid, believed that she was behaving threateningly. E.g., when I suggested she read my monograph on the subject, she said in what I took to be a threatening tone, "Oh, I've read it. I've read evvvverrything." (b) (6) present. Intimidation and humiliation.

2/13/19 (b) (6) said I should be here in the office for teaching partners, be a "den mom." It's not what she expected to have to do but she does it. Said to ask my teaching partners all the time what they need to feel comfortable, as she does. Questionable whether she actually does this based on her presentations in bootstrap. Certainly I constantly ask teaching partners what they want to do with seminar, grading, etc. Still nothing from teaching partners themselves. Intimidation. Humiliating. Denies my experience and professional expertise. I would bet money she would not say this to a man. Also, despite persistent complaints that I do not spend enough time in my office, until relatively recently I was spending a full day there four days a week [most faculty are not in on Fridays]. Apparently my hours [7:30 am to about 2 pm without lunch or PT break] did not overlap sufficiently with those colleagues criticizing me for not being present.

Commentary: You can see the consistent message over time that I am doing things wrong and I'm unprofessional and unskilled. Also that I am at fault for all complaints and problems raised by others. Also the attempts to smear me: man hater, feminist, journalist so can't trust her, mil hater, vegan (!). See with (b) (6) the so-called queen bee syndrome (prevent other women from rising behind you) and with her and others the competence trap (women who are competent are seen as unlikeable). A number of my colleagues are evidently threatened by my existence. That's not a problem I can fix. Intimidation, humiliation, threats to my job based on gender assumptions.

NOTE THE GAP IN (b) (6) CRITICISM IN 2017 in above evidence. This was the year she told me she'd become a big fan and wanted me to stay in the department. Something changed for (b) (6) again later, though. I think it was my declining to behave like her despite her continued insistence that I do so. She's felt badly treated for all her 20-odd years in the department and attributes it to sexism. She apparently developed an apologetic persona when speaking that was intended to avoid seeming threatening to her colleagues, as did (b) (6) and (b) (6) (mentioned above). Since I arrived, neither (b) (6) nor (b) (6) does this any more. Big change.

Commentary:

Talk to (b) (6), who reported to the senior faculty at the end of SLC 2016 on the complaints from (b) (6) and (b) (6) finding no support for their accusations. This should have been the end of it, but (b) (6) has kept the narrative alive ever since in trying to damage my reputation and my career. This also poisons the well in terms of my relationships with colleagues, particularly military faculty.

Talk to (b) (6) in NSA about her experiences with sexism teaching in S&P. Also regarding the larger problem at the NWC, about NSA training new women faculty differently from men without regard for experience.

Talk to administrator (b) (6).

Talk to (b) (6): only overlapped in department with me for a year, I think, and he's not attuned to gender issues, but he can confirm that I've been struggling with how to address this situation from the beginning. I have spoken with him several times with the sexism of the department and asked his advice on handling the team teaching dynamic. On 4/1/19 I informally told (b) (6) about (b) (6) and others' bullying and harassment, focusing on my realization that it's not me but them and that I can't fix their perceptions of how women are supposed to act. Gaslighting by (b) (6) and also (b) (6).

Talk to (b) (6), a long-time mil member of the department. Don't know his position on me and my problems but could be useful for department dynamics and any observations he's made about my behavior and others' treatment of me.

Talk to teaching partners:

(b) (6)

I have no idea if any of these people will tell you things supportive of my claims. Some are likely to express dislike for me. I suggest them as people who might have useful information for you. When you talk to (b) (6) she may well say that she's done all of this and it was to help me and the department and the college. Her good intentions do not mitigate the damage she's done to my reputation and career in creating a hostile work environment based on my gender.

(b) (6) attempts to prevent my promotion:

11/14/17 (b) (6) and (b) (6) both said I'm in good shape for promotion. This while (b) (6) was trying to be friendly.

4/8/19 In promotion committee meeting: (b) (6) asked person reporting on my scholarship what role he played in my work being published in a journal he's an editor with. Profound lack of understanding of how journals work and attempt to discredit me as well as the editor.

As chair of my departmental promotion committee, (b) (6) questioned my teaching partners in attempt to prevent my promotion. Apparently the worst thing anyone could come up with was that they weren't sure I liked them.

(b) (6) told one member of the committee that as chair her plan had been to turn all the members against my promotion.

5/27/20 Learned that (b) (6) conveyed to my teaching partner at the beginning of the ILC 2019 term that he should take notes on me and my behavior. Continued attempt to destroy my career by preventing my promotion. Poisons my ability to work with colleagues. Attempted self-fulfilling prophecy, potentially. Humiliating, attack on my professionalism, intimidating. This is what made me decide that I had to take the problem outside the department. I realized that I still wasn't safe from this harassment and bullying.

Double standard on promotion: 1/21/14 bootstrap junior faculty member (b) (6) said our students possibly have the capabilities of civilian undergraduates. Continues to show contempt for students. Still promoted in Fall 2018.

Double standard on promotion: 7/18/20 Senior faculty (b) (6) and (b) (6) who both fought my promotion the previous year, said to other senior faculty that full reports on teaching, scholarship, and service aren't necessary for colleague (b) (6) tenure application process. Only need a paragraph or two. Also, (b) (6) and (b) (6) said there was no need to talk to his teaching partners, though (b) (6) had made a point of doing so in my case the previous year.

Potential double standard on promotion: It will be interesting to see what happens with (b) (6) application for promotion in process this year [he applied last year as required but the process was disrupted by the pandemic]. He has few publications and no book yet. Has some evaluations that he believes are very bad. If he's promoted when I was not, it could look like a double standard.

Commentary: Much of this info came to me by chance and over time. I don't know if there is more bad behavior that I haven't heard about. Some of it may be well known to other members of the department. I have no way of knowing.

I have also been told that a number of “tenured” faculty expressed discomfort with my non-feminine demeanor in the meeting to discuss my promotion, showing that beliefs about gendered behavior is the basis for criticism of me.

Members of my departmental promotion committee:

(b) (6) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] sat in and took notes, which should still exist

Also talk to all “tenured” faculty. I don’t know which of them attended the meeting to discuss my promotion:

(b) (6)

Nick Murray

(b) (6)

Re (b) (6) :

Two points

2/11/19 (b) (6) yelled at me re a student complaining that I accused him of cheating or trying to cheat. (b) (6) complained to everyone she could find in the office about me, I was told. As I told you in relating my experience of this event and the interaction with a student that preceded it, I did not accuse the student of cheating or trying to cheat. I also relayed to you what I understood to be her story. I know you will talk with her yourself. She was so angry that I was afraid of her. Mask of anger, seemed unable to rein herself in even in chair's office with him. Beside herself. I have rarely seen anyone this angry, and never in a professional context.

(b) (6) and I witnesses.

Talk to others in office that day about her spreading her accusation. I am sure she spoke with (b) (6) and (b) (6). (b) (6) because she told me so and (b) (6) because he started an email discussion on the subject among senior faculty shortly thereafter. Possibly others. Don't know who else was there but you can ask them and (b) (6) herself. Damaged my reputation and ability to work with colleagues.

2/14/19 I was told that (b) (6), Nick Murray, and (b) (6) were trying to get me punished or reprimanded somehow for allegedly accusing a student of cheating.

5/14/19 I met with (b) (6) the chair to discuss the “tenured” faculty meeting on my promotion. I asked him if there was anything he’s concerned about that I could try to address before he made his recommendation on my promotion. He said there was an accusation that I take criticism badly (I was also told that the claim was that I flatly rejected (b) (6) feedback on one of my lectures). Simply not true. It’s all in email. See my PDF response to (b) (6)

with all of the (b) (6) exchange. The emails are not in perfect order: Sorry! Also, I changed the lecture slide that offended her.

(b) (6) accusation was evidently taken seriously, or at least taken seriously as a tool to prevent my promotion. Damaging to my reputation and ability to work in the department. Terrible thing to say about a scholar. Humiliating, intimidating.

Re Murray:

Three points

During my application for promotion last year, 2018-2019, he repeatedly emailed the International Security Program at the Kennedy School to ask if the monograph that I wrote and they published was peer reviewed. There was already a letter in my file from the director of the program saying the monograph was peer reviewed. This is important because my promotion file would be weaker if the monograph had not been peer reviewed. See my 8/3/19 private email to the dean alerting him to this for his situational awareness. In PDF form, it includes Murray's email exchanges with ISP. The then-chair, (b) (6), and others also have this email string. I do not know who else (b) (6) forwarded it to. Attempt to damage my reputation and prevent my promotion. Embarrassing for NWC. (b) (6) at HKS asks the investigator to contact her. Humiliating, intimidating, threatening.

5/14/19 Chair emailed me that the "tenured" faculty meeting on my promotion was delayed by a Murray email circulated that weekend. He expressed a variety of opinions in it, making egregious claims about my record in saying I should not be promoted. The one serious matter of fact that the chair, (b) (6), told me I could address was Murray's claim that "one faculty member has formally complained about her (b) (6) unprofessional interactions with a student." HR issued a memo for my promotion file saying that it has no complaint about me. The other matter of fact that the chair said I could address was the claim that I never thanked Murray properly the times he took my seminars when I was ill. Murray also said that I'm ill an awful lot, which is a legal and HR can of worms to even imply. The chair and all the rest of the "tenured" faculty have the email, as do HR and the JAG's. Damaging to my reputation and ability to work with colleagues. Humiliating, threat to my job, attack on my professionalism. I think his actions to damage my career are the result of my inadvertently hurting his male pride in our few prior interactions. Tell story.

There is also the matter I mentioned in my original email of Murray taking me off an awards committee, which makes my service role look thinner at promotion time. I do not know what his motivation was but it seemed an odd decision given how, in my experience, these committees usually function. It is also possible that Murray doesn't know how these committees usually function and didn't ask anyone.